

I strongly oppose the recent decision by Sinclair Broadcasting to impose the airing of a biased and partisan political documentary ("Stolen Honor") days before the election. This move is clearly an act of Republican partisanship. A similar move on the part of the Democratic party would be loudly decried by the present Administration. So why should it be permitted on behalf of Republican causes?

This abuse of media fairness and impartiality is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. Because Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, it is obligated by law to serve the interest of the public at large, regardless of political orientation.

When large companies exert dictatorial control over local subsidiaries, they are serving their own financial interests, not the democratic (that's "small-d" democratic) needs of the public at large. Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Thank you.